United States District Court Southern District of Texas

Case Number: OSCV1847

ATTACHMENT

Description.				
□ State Cou	rt Record	State Court Record Continued		
□ Administrative Record				
Document continued - Part 15 of				
□ Exhibit to:	number(s) / le	etter(s)		
Other:				

remember, is there was nothing said, you know, well, I think he is or he isn't, that type of conversation. And I think after we get final place to deliberate we'll be able to discuss specifics and, you know, and whatever little bit was discussed or it will all be re-discussed in a more open environment so we can fully come to a conclusion as to what this case is about.

- Q. Okay. Just kind of an uncomfortable situation for you to be put in a spot like this,
 - A. I understand.

- Q. That's why this court asked you to come in and just be candid, recite if you recall. If you don't recall, that's fine too. We're not here to pick on you.
 - A. I understand.
- Q. Thank you, sir. Appreciate your help.
 BY MR. SMYTH:
- Q. Just a couple of questions, sir. I am Don Smyth. I am an assistant district attorney. I am sure you don't remember that from two days ago.

Let me make sure so I understand. You have not formed an opinion as to how you would

vote on this case one way or another?

A. Absolutely not.

- Q. Obviously you haven't heard all the evidence.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. You have not got the judge's charge so you don't know the law that applies to the facts that you have heard?
- A. That's correct. One of the things I do remember specific was we were wondering if we were going to get a chance to ask the judge exactly what was expected of us and how we were to be able to come to a conclusion as one specific I remember.
- Q. And you will learn that you'll get a piece of paper that gives you all that information. That's one reason you're not suppose to be discussing anything because you don't know what law applies anyhow. So the judge is going to give you the court's charge that has all the law and procedure you're to follow in that. Since you haven't formed an opinion one way or another on how you'd vote in this case, I assume you haven't expressed any opinion to anybody about I'm going to vote this

way or I'm going to vote that way?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Anybody expressed an opinion that they've reached a conclusion one way or another?
- A. I don't think any specific opinions were discussed, no.
 - Q. Have you guys taken a straw poll?
 - A. No.

- Q. How many people thinks this way or how many think that way?
 - A. Absolutely not.
- Q. Taken any kind of votes or anything like that?
 - A. Absolutely not.
- Q. I think you indicated that the only admonishment you recall hearing was judge asked you not to discuss this with family or friends?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. You don't recall hearing any other admonishment from the court -- I'm not suggesting that the court did -- that you're not to discuss it among yourselves until after you get all the evidence, get the court's charge. You don't recall that?
 - A. Right. I remember last night before

we left the judge said he needed to make pretty clear that we were not to discuss this with family or friends because we had not heard all the evidence and that the evidence presented was not complete also.

- Q. Okay. Would any discussion that's been had up to this point, would that have any effect on whatever the verdict you might eventually render?
 - A. Absolutely not.

- Q. Could you set aside anything that you heard in the way of a discussion about this case or about any witnesses or about anybody's desire to hear a particular piece of evidence until you get all of the evidence in, until you get the court's charge, then talk about?
- A. Can you repeat the first part of that?
- Q. Could you set aside any discussion you heard so far?
 - A. No, I could not.
- Q. Set aside and not consider whatever has been said out there, also whatever has been said in this room, could you set that aside, render your verdict solely based upon the

evidence you get in this case, the court's charge as to what the law is?

A. Absolutely.

- Q. After you deliberate with all your fellow jurors, once you receive the case?
- A. Absolutely, because I do not feel that anything was said out there that would ever interject any opinions either way.
- Q. Okay. Could you promise the judge as well as the attorneys for Mr. Eldridge that you won't discuss anything about this case from this point on?
 - A. I can quarantee it.
- Q. Okay. Also, would you also promise all of us that you won't discuss amongst the other jurors what happened to you inside this room, what questions were asked you, what answers you gave?
 - A. Guarantee it.
- Q. Because, obviously, that has nothing to do with how this case is decided. Could you put aside anything that's happened to this point in the trial, especially being called in here, kind of put on the hot seat, not let that affect the way you vote in this case?

A. Absolutely.

Q. Okay. I have no further questions, judge.

MR. HILL: I've no questions. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Do me a favor, have a seat out in the hallway.

MS. CRAWFORD: Judge, to clear things up, the second gentleman who I believe Mr.

Johnson indicated that one of the persons outside was the gentleman, he said this to all of us, was the gentleman who is seated in the last chair, who stands because the witnesses can't get by.

THE COURT: Do you know who that is?

MS. CRAWFORD: I know who he was. I said he was not there because he was not there.

THE COURT: Go look again.

MR. SMYTH: Didn't Mr. Johnson point this guy out to the bailiff? Did he say this is the guy I'm talking about?

 $exttt{MS. CRAWFORD:}$ Then as $exttt{Mr. Johnson was}$ leaving.

MR. SMYTH: Just want to make sure Freddy brought in the person that Mr. Johnson

said it was the guy in the striped shirt. So whatever.

MS. CRAWFORD: Can we have Mr. Johnson say if this was the man also? As he was leaving, I said was that the man he was referring to at that time, he said no.

THE COURT: Ask Mr. Johnson back in, please.

(Juror Johnson enters the courtroom).

THE COURT: Mr. Johnson, let me ask

you a question. You now see who is out in the
hallway.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you feel like we talked to everybody who was present during this conversation, or is there anybody else?

THE JUROR: There was one other gentleman.

THE COURT: Okay. Freddy, do you know which one that is?

THE BAILIFF: No, sir.

THE COURT: Once again, Mr. Johnson, go to the door.

THE JUROR: Sure.

THE COURT: Hate to put this burden on

you, go to the doorway, see what he is wearing, 1 come tell Freddy so we can talk to him, too. 2 THE JUROR: He's wearing a blue 3 striped shirt with horn-rimmed glasses. 4 standing back there. 5 THE COURT: Let's quit for lunch after 6 7 this. Come on up. Tell me your name. 8 THE JUROR: It's Buel Shastid. 9 B-u-e-l and S-h-a-s like Shasta Cola with 10 11 t-i-d. THE COURT: Mr. Shastid, you've done 12 nothing wrong, you're not in trouble. Okay? 13 THE JUROR: 14 Okay. THE COURT: But we do need to talk to 15 you about conversation held outside the 16 courtroom this morning. 17 THE JUROR: Yes, sir. 18 That's what we want to THE COURT: 19 So I want to put you under oath. 2.0 (Oath administered to juror Shastid). 21 THE COURT: If you can come up and 22

have a seat on the witness stand.

24

23

EXAMINATION

BY MR. HILL:

- Q. Good morning sir. How you doing?
- A. All right.
- Q. I'm Wayne Hill. I don't know if you recall from a couple of days ago.

Just so that the record is clear, you're one of the jurors in this case? And you have sat and listened to the testimony up to the point of March 2nd, 1994; correct?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. And approximately what time did you arrive here this morning to resume your service as a juror in this case?
- A. I didn't have any watch on, but I think I got here right about maybe five minutes after nine, maybe five minutes before nine. It wasn't exactly 9:00 because I was rushing to make a phone call.
- Q. I assure you the judge isn't going to criticize you for being a few minutes too early or too late because we're all busy in the morning trying to get things done.

When you first arrived here, did you meet in the hallway that's immediately outside

this courtroom area near some benches?

- A. As I came in, first I walked down here, there was nobody waiting on the bench, I tried the door, door was locked. This door was locked. So I went to the restroom, then I came back and sat down.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. I was by myself when I sat down. And then the guy, I think juror number eighteen, the blonde hair guy, I don't know his name, either, he came in, he sat down. Let's see. Then came the first guy that you all called in.
- Q. Okay. So there was roughly three, maybe four people? Was there a female?
- A. We started out with three, then little by little the other jurors started coming in, and then another bailiff besides our bailiff came in, unlocked the door, then we came inside.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk first about what took place outside in the hallway. That's what the judge was initially asking you about. What conversations were taking place out there?
- A. When we were out there in the hall, we were, let's see, there was one guy, there was one guy on the jury there that, first of all,

let me tell you. We misunderstood that we couldn't talk about it among ourselves. I just thought we couldn't talk about it to relatives or friends.

Q. That's all right.

- A. So when we were talking about it when we were in that, way over there in that jury room over there, when we were talking about it over there, what we were really doing was just exploring our thoughts on it, like we were wondering if maybe, he was wondering if maybe the prosecuting, not prosecuting but the guy that worked for the mental health mental retardation unit, we couldn't remember if he had actually said that he was going, that he was going to look for what do you call it when somebody is faking it?
 - O. Malingering?
- A. If he had actually said I'm going to check this guy out, look for malingering. We were trying to remember if he actually said that. I told him, well, it would be in the transcript of the thing, and I said we thought that what he had said was that he thought he had seen evidence of malingering but he didn't know

for sure so he was going to try and get a second opinion on it, and then it was really just kind of a comparison and contrast between the two doctors that were actually up here. And we were talking about the first doctor. We were trying to determine if he had ever given an answer, you know, a definite answer one way or the other about whether he thought the guy was incompetent or not, and we were trying to remember if he had ever used that term malingering or not.

Q. Okay.

- A. And we were really trying to remember -- we were really kind of talking over what we'd really seen and heard trying to figure out what we'd seen.
- Q. Was there a give and take among the various jurors when that was going on where everybody was actively participating and you talking about?
- A. As it tends to be, the three men were talking. The ladies were sitting not talking, you know, because a lot of times it's just men are talking, the ladies won't talk.
- Q. Now, let me clarify for one minute.
 You were talking about the other jury room, you

pointed -- obviously we have no point of reference here. Are you talking about something that you were talking about today, or is this yesterday afternoon that you were referring to?

- A. Yesterday afternoon one of the jurors had brought up the idea, the concept that the psychologist that was, that for the mental health and mental retardation had maybe had a biased observation. You remember the psychologist himself brought that up, that you could have a biased observation if you go in looking for something.
 - Q. Right.

- A. And he was of the opinion that the psychologist was biased in his observation and, furthermore, that the other doctors over there at the unit and nurses and everybody over there was biased, and we were of the opinion that they wouldn't have any reason for being biased because their idea was to make sure everybody got a fair trial and as opposed to either being innocent or not innocent.
- Q. Okay. Well, carrying forward to this morning, when you were out on the bench, did you pick up with that same type of conversation or

discussion regarding basically what I would guess called the credibility of the experts?

- A. Well, when the guy came back in, we were trying, we were trying, we were talking over how this idea of the preponderance of the evidence, and we knew that in regular criminal cases that if the Defense has a benefit of what you call it, shadow of doubt, you know, if there is doubt about it you're suppose to assume that a defendant is innocent.
 - Q. Sure. Right.

A. We had the instruction at the very first that we're suppose to assume that the guy is competent unless proven to be incompetent by not the Defense but the -- I don't know exactly how you call it in this case, and we were just wondering if maybe that other guy didn't have that concept down because it seemed like he was, I don't know exactly how to put it, but it seemed like he just really thought all the testimony that came from the mental health and mental retardation was just worthless testimony, and we were of the opinion that the testimony on both sides was not worthless, that, you know, it all had to be considered.

- Q. Okay. Was that discussion taking place -- I know it's difficult because we're kind of segmented or fragmented when all these conversations were taking place?
 - A. Well, he brought it up at first.
 - O. Go ahead.

- A. Do you remember that, I am sorry to address the bailiff, but I don't remember that furtherest jury room we went to when we were waiting yesterday. We went to so many of them, you know. But when we were sitting over there I think maybe it could have been after lunch.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask the questions so the record is, because he has not been sworn in to testify yet.
 - A. I'm trying to get location.
- Q. You were in the courthouse, it's before the judge instructed you as to whether or not you were suppose to deliberate at all; correct?
- A. The judge, no, we hadn't had a direct thing from the judge saying to deliberate, no, sir.
- Q. Or to say not to deliberate, for that matter?

- Q. All right. When was it that you recall Judge Harmon giving you instructions you couldn't talk to friends and family?
- A. Well, in the first place, we had heard it almost -- I'm trying to think -- that we had heard about that on the day when we were picked as a jury.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. I was trying to remember if we had heard it from the bailiff or if we heard it from a judge, you know. I can't say for sure if we heard from the bailiff or if we heard it from the judge or if we heard it from one of the attorneys, but we heard it from somebody.
- Q. But clearly in your mind you didn't feel, you didn't have any reason to think that you were doing anything at all improper in discussing the evidence that you had heard up until the point in time that people started being brought in this morning, being questioned?
- A. Well, we thought that as long we didn't discuss it with our friends and family,

that everything was all right. And we were kind of proud ourselves for not discussing with our friends and family. When we were patting ourself on the back, then people started being called back in, we thought, oh, boy, we thought we were doing right.

- Q. And as far as you knew you were doing right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. There's no blame here, okay?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And I think that's real important because as a juror you're coming down here, you're doing your civic duty making sure you and the eleven others make a decision in this case correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Not about what you read in the newspaper and criticism about as it might be about the jury system, you're the one hearing all the evidence.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Can you be as candid as you can with me. I've got thick skin. I am not going to get hurt in the least bit.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. For you to tell me if there were any comments made either outside here this morning or maybe in the room or at anytime regarding the fact that, you know, that a witness has a motive to either lie or to testify in a certain way?
- I think the statement that you heard, Α. and I think I was the one that made it, was that when we were thinking about that idea of the bias either from the mental health and mental retardation or bias from the Defense psychologist, that it seemed like, that if one of them had a bias, there again, referring to what that one juror was saying, that he thought that the mental health and mental retardation guy was biased and all those other people were biased too, that we thought, well, if anybody was going to be biased it seemed it be more likely somebody who was hired for one certain thing as opposed to somebody that was on a contract.
- Q. Okay. And was that same statement or content of that discussed in the hallway this morning?
 - A. I made that statement in the hall this

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

morning.

- O. You did?
- A. I did.
- Q. Tell Judge Harmon as best you can recall, I don't want to paraphrase, I'll attempt to, but tell me if I got it wrong.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. I mean, would it have been something like, well, you know, defense expert is going to testify the way the defense wants them to?
- might have heard the end of the sentence because I think that it would have been prefaced by if one of them was going to it would be the defense because then the defense might be able to get other spot contracts, but I said that somebody who is already on a contract, you know, and gets I didn't say assigned cases, what did he say, they were assigned cases randomly. I didn't state all of that because we already had that information, but I said as far as somebody on a contract who is going to have the same amount of work no matter how the testimony turns out.
- Q. Okay. And that statement was made in the hallway this morning prior to coming into

court here today on March the 2nd, 1994?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay.

- A. And I also stated, it seems like, I didn't say, I didn't state it as a fact, and everybody knows that, as far as I know everybody knows that what we were talking about was to stay as impartial as we possibly could all the way through, so we really have wanted to be impartial from the very first.
- Q. Would you agree or disagree with me that at various times up until right now, when we're in court, just one on one talking, with the judge here, that the jury either in small groups of less than twelve or all twelve together have sat and discussed the evidence in the case?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Has there been any kind of give and take or discussion or argument, let's say heated discussions regarding the evidence?
- A. The only one that even came close was this idea of whether or not the mental health and retardation guy would have been, would have been biased. And you have to know that we never

did say that the defense psychologist was biased. What we were doing was we were using an analogy, saying that if, you know, why would he be biased or the other one be biased. If one was going to be biased, it seemed would be somebody on spot contract as opposed to period contract.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Just for my reference, what do you mean spot contract as opposed to continuing one?
- Like defense hired psychologist to go and interview a client just for an hour, I would say that would be like a job, you know, that Y'all wouldn't have him on contract to do that for y'all all the time because you do client by client, whereas the prosecution is an ongoing thing, they're always here, so they have people going over to the Harris County jail and they get their information from the data that they get from the mental unit over there, and from the doctors, that the consultants, the way we understood it, the consultants, whichever doctor it happened to be, would be the consultant that would testify, if they had whichever client they had that they happened to get randomly.

Q. Tell us your honest feelings about whether you formed an opinion at this point as to the verdict that you would personally return. I am not asking you to tell me what it is, but if you have reached a point in hearing the evidence that you have already formed an opinion.

Well, based on the testimony that I Α. But that's another thing that already got, yes. we also said, that we were not going to allow ourselves to make a definite decision one way or the other, that since it was going to be on a preponderance of the evidence. You have to remember that most of the conversation was trying to convince the other ones that you better not make up your mind ahead of time because we won't put up with your making up your mind ahead of time because we're not letting ourselves make up our mind ahead of time, that sort of thing. So if the thing was done right away, I think I would of had a vote one way or Yes, I would be leaning one way or the another. other.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

A. Because you said not to say.

- Q. Right. I don't want you to tell us.
- A. But I'm still open to other evidence and other discussion, and we know the trial was not over, so we were definitely, as far as I know, nobody on the jury said that I'm going to vote this way or the other.
- Q. Did you get the impression, though, that most, if not all, the people have already kind of settled into having an opinion as to the outcome of the case?
- A. It seems to me the ones that already have that already have an in stone attitude about which way they would vote is kind of a lifestyle thing that they would have went that way one way or the other.
 - Q. Really?

A. But being a school teacher, I have learned to be an objective observer; and, so, natural you're going to have an opinion one way or the other, but I don't let my opinions through the empirical evidence. And, so, I want to hear all the evidence. And you remember on the first day while y'all asked why I was smiling. The reason I was smiling was because it seemed like this is the way to find out if a

client is not right in the mind, seems to me, as opposed to doing it when it comes to the trial for, you know, guilty or innocent. Find out if they need treatment, see if they should have stood trial in the first place. And I was smiling because I had never heard of this before and this sounded like the way to do it.

Q. Right.

- A. So from the very first, man, this is something good, this is something I'm going to be involved in.
- Q. Maybe we should of asked you to explain to the rest of the people that were sitting there because there were a lot of people that didn't get it.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay, just one minute, judge.

MR. HILL: I'll pass the witness.

Thank you, sir.

BY MR. SMYTH:

Q. Just a couple of questions, sir. Mr. Shastid, my name is Don Smyth. I am an assistant district attorney here in Harris County, Texas. And I just want to make sure I'm clear on a couple of points.

First of all, you understand you haven't received all the evidence, don't know what the law that's going to tell you how you should vote or how you should apply that evidence hasn't been given to you yet.

A. Yes, I do.

- O. So the case is not over?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. Would it be fair to say you have not formed an opinion, since the case is not over, you don't have it yet, you have not formed an opinion one way or the other?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. You're open I think you said to hearing any other evidence that may come in?
- A. I'm open and bound and determined to be open.
- Q. You have not expressed your opinion to anybody else; have you? Since you don't have the opinion, you have not expressed it to anybody?
- A. If anything, all I did was restated evidence that was already given.
- Q. Has anybody else, as far as you know, expressed an opinion they're going to vote one

way or another say at this point?

- A. Nobody has come right out and said I am going to vote one way or another.
 - Q. You have not taken a straw poll?
- A. No way, no, sir, because that was one of the things that we saying, we want to hear all the evidence, we will not let ourselves go one way or the other. In fact, that's why we jumped on that one guy that thought the mental health and retardation guy was biased looking for malingering, you know, because it sounded like he was making up his mind ahead of time. That's why we jumped on him.
- Q. You have not taken any kind of vote this morning?
 - A. No way.
- Q. And did you indicate the only admonishment that you recall was at some point in time somebody told you not to talk to your friends and family about the case?
- A. That's right. And I also will say that when we went to lunch over there, bailiff said not to talk about the case at all.
 - Q. Bailiff told you that?
 - A. The bailiff said that, but I thought

that was because we were at lunch.

- Q. Because you're in a public place or something?
 - A. Right.

- Q. As far as the court, you don't recall the judge, I'm not saying he did, but you don't recall the judge telling you not to discuss the case among yourselves at this point?
- A. I do not recall the judge saying that, and I'm not saying that he didn't say it, I am just saying I don't recall it.
- Q. Okay. Would any of the discussions that you heard so far have any effect upon what verdict you eventually reach once you get all the evidence, have the law?
- A. I don't think it would. Just to give you an example of the type of people that are on the jury, one of the men out there and I were arguing about whether it should be health care plan or not. He said no matter what you say, you're not going to change my mind into thinking there should be a health plan. Well, you don't worry about me saying anything because you're not going to change your mind, and I'm not either. So, no, sir. I honestly believe that

nobody has gone any way except from the evidence.

- Q. So nobody. You're not aware of any opinions of what their position is?
- A. If opinion involves a decision, no, sir.
- Q. Okay. That's what we're talking about.
- A. Because you have the sub opinions before you make final opinion, before you make your decision.
 - Q. I'm talking final.
 - A. No final opinion, no, sir.
- Q. I'm talking opinion on ultimate decision that's going to be decided.
 - A. No, sir.
 - Q. No opinion expressed?
- A. No, sir. Anytime somebody was leaning that way, we would straighten them out, remind them the judge said that it was preponderance of evidence and that you don't make a decision until you heard all the evidence.
- Q. Okay. Could you set aside anything that you may have heard in discussions at this point and base whatever final ultimate decision

you make solely upon all of the evidence, once you get the charge from the judge, once the jury has deliberated in the case?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Could you promise us not to discuss this case any further among your fellow jurors or your friends and family?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Could you put aside what has happened in this jury room -- you're one of several that have been called in here, not let that influence any opinion that you may ultimately reach on the ultimate issue in this case?
- A. Yes, sir, especially since it was along the same lines to make sure it was impartial decision like we've been so deadset on.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. You know, one thing that the bailiff overheard us talking about in the jury room over there, we weren't talking about this case, we were talking about the Branch Davidian type thing. The reason it came up is because I saw the attorney that was David Koresh's attorney in the building, that's what we were talking about

when the bailiff stuck his head in there. He admonished us not to talk about our case.

- Q. That's the only restriction. You can talk about all kinds of things. Not like you can sit there like twelve bumps on a log and say nothing, stare at each other. You're just not to suppose to discuss this case until you have all the evidence and you have the law that applies to the case. Can you promise us that you will do that?
 - A. Absolutely.

MR. SMYTH: I have no further questions.

BY MR. HILL:

- Q. Two questions, Mr. Shastid. Do you recall there was any evidence from any source that said that Doctor Austin, the first witness to testify, was in fact hired by the defense?
 - A. That was an assumption on my part.
 - Q. All right.
 - A. And I apologize if it was erroneous.
- Q. No, I'm just asking specifically whether or not you heard anything to that effect.

Number two, has anybody concluded that

a doctor, in this case Doctor Austin, was hired by the defense to give a specific finding of incompetency?

No, sir. In fact, I'm not Α. paraphrasing my statement at all when I say that we never said that he had a bias and we never said that the prosecution, the prosecution, the mental health and retardation guy had one, What we were saying was that they were either. doing their job impartially like we were. was the flow of the conversation. And anytime somebody said, well, such and such is on that side, no, he is not. You know. Then we would use that, you know, back and forth. If one was going to be it, the other one was, and, you know, it was an assumption on my part that he was hired by the defense.

Q. Okay.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That was not just, you know, my opinion. Everybody shook their head when I said that, but we said if he was hired by the defense and wanted to be hired in other cases then he might do it, but nobody ever said that he did do it, just like no one would go along with the idea that the prosecution had witnesses that

made up their mind before they ever got in there.

- Q. When you say that if he had gotten hired by the defense in this case that he might do it, might give a finding of incompetency, what, so he could be hired in future cases?
- A. We thought if the likelihood of one way or another, it would be more likely would be one working on defense case by case than someone working on the contract for the State in an ongoing period of time. But no one ever said that they would. We just said that guy had said that the one for the mental health and retardation was biased.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. It was only used as an analogy to say that he wasn't biased.
 - Q. Thank you.
- MS. SMYTH: I have nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.
- THE COURT: Thank you. Do me a favor. Just have seat outside in the hallway.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- MR. HILL: May I have moment so I can talk to Denice?

THE COURT: Let's stay off the record. (Off the record).

THE COURT: Let's go on the record.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. HILL: Judge, based on the testimony that has been adduced this morning, starting with Mr. Licata then through several other witnesses, that in varying degrees denied that this conversation or that the comments that Mr. Licata overheard took place in the hallway, finally Mr. Shastid comes in, he admits that he had made those type of statements. Now, in the context of whether we have a specific verbatim comment from Mr. Licata versus what Mr. Shastid says validates basically what Mr. Licata overheard first thing this morning. testimony here in varying degrees that the jury has at least engaged in partial and preliminary deliberations beginning yesterday, on March 1, 1994, prior to the time that the court admonished the jury before leaving yesterday afternoon that they should not communicate with anybody regarding the case, they engaged in those discussions at least partially with four or five people in the hallway this morning, then again continuing with less than twelve people in the waiting area or the waiting room of this courtroom, then subsequently with all twelve people. Again, they have not been given the jury charge, they have not heard all the evidence, the testimony is not closed in the case, the court did not give an admonishment. Once jurors were brought in one by one so that deliberation at least in part with less than twelve people were continuing while we were conducting this hearing this morning, I think that the sum and substance of all of the testimony is that the jury has been engaging in the type of the conduct, albeit in an innocent manner from their perspective, in the type of conduct that should only come after all of the evidence is in, the testimony is closed, final arguments are given, the charge is submitted to them, so that they can deliberate as a group, all twelve at one time, we feel that it is necessary to ask the jury to, I am sorry, the court to discharge the jury, declare a mistrial in this hearing on the basis that Art. 1.04, 1.05, 1.051, 1.09, 1.13, 1.14 of the Code of Criminal procedure as well as Art. 1.15 of the Code of Criminal Procedure have been violated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And that, additionally, Art. 35.23, 36.14, 36.16, 36.18 and 36.21 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure have been violated, and that the U.S. Constitutional amendments number five, six, eight and fourteen have been violated, and that the Texas Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 10, 13, 15, 19 have been violated and that this defendant's substantial rights have been prejudiced by the proceedings as they have been conducted up to this point in time and, therefore, we would respectfully request that the court discharge this jury as impaneled and declare a mistrial.

THE COURT: I want the record to reflect that the court has observed the witnesses testify. Court is of the absolute opinion, that other than comments made by certain individual jurors about their feelings as to the credibility of certain witnesses, that none of those statements were made in an attempt to influence the opinion of any other jurors, that they're nothing more than personal comments. The court is also of the opinion that the comments were not made in the context of any kind of deliberations by those groups of jurors

to determine the outcome of this case. The court is absolutely convinced that each of those jurors was aware at the time, still aware, that the jurors cannot reach a decision until after they've heard all the evidence. And the court is also convinced that all those jurors can set aside the discussions that were made outside the presence of the -- outside the courtroom and make their decision based solely upon what they heard testified to from the witness stand and not allow any comments made by any other jurors to influence their decision whatsoever.

Now, let me take a quick look at those sections, especially the 35 and 36.

(Off the record).

THE COURT: Motion for mistrial is denied. The court has reviewed all of those sections, but the Defense motion for mistrial is denied.

(All jurors brought in at this time before the court).

THE COURT: I know everyone knows we talked to some of you this morning and have not talked to others. And I want to let everyone know that no one has done anything wrong. The

only person that did anything wrong is me. made a mistake. I take full responsibility for it. I should have instructed you all yesterday that -- and I'm very well aware that I told you all last night not to talk to your friends or family about the case, I should have included instructions not to discuss the case amongst yourselves until the trial is over. something I generally do at various phases during the trial because when that usually occurs is lunch time. At any rate, that's neither here nor there. At any rate, I assume responsibility. However, we're now going to get back on track, all right. The people we talked to this morning aren't going to talk about what we talked about in here, so don't ask them about They've been told not to talk about it, so I'm telling the rest of you all not to ask them about it. So let's get back on track. going to finish the trial this afternoon. should still be able to get the trial concluded today. And let's focus on what you all heard from the witness stand yesterday, focus on what you will hear from the witness stand today. going to read to you all the charge when that is

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

concluded, give you all the law in Texas that pertains to how you all need to make your decision, give you all some instructions, and make your decision. So it's twelve thirty, we're going to break for lunch. As soon as Freddy is ready, he'll take you all to lunch. We'll be in recess until 1:30.

(Recess for lunch).

7/863

TRIAL COURT NO. 9403201

APPELLATE COURT NO._____ IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN GERALD CORNELIUS ELDRIDGE, Appellant VS. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee. 11 APPEAL FROM 178TH DISTRICT COURT OF HARRIS COUNTY, 12 TEXAS 13 Judge William T. Harmon Presiding 14 15 16 STATEMENT OF FACTS 17

volume 4 of 36 volumes

March 1, 1994

Ida M. Garcia

Official Court Reporter
FILED IN
301 San Jacinto COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
Houston, Texas 77002 AUG 17 1994
Thomas Lowe, Clerk

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	INDEX	
2	VOLUME 4	
3	March 1, 1994	
4		
5	CONTESTED COMPETENCY HEARING	
6		
7		<u>Page</u>
8	<u>DEFENSE WITNESSES</u>	
9		
10	RICHARD B. AUSTIN, JR. Direct	6
11	Jury removed Jury returned	12 21
12	Direct, cont'd Cross	2 2 3 9
13		9 8 9 9
14	Redirect	111
15	DEFENSE RESTS	119
1.0	STATE'S WITNESSES	
16	EDWARD G. SILVERMAN	1.0.0
17	Cross	120 184
18	Redirect	208
19	STEVE DEMENT Direct	210
20		222
21	DARRELL OBEY Direct	223
2 2		229
23	JOHN SCOTT Direct	233
2 4		200
25		

i.